

### REMARKS

In response to the action of April 25, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-21 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 10 and 18-21 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 17-21 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 4, line 17 to page 5, line 28. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for nonstatutory subject matter. In response, independent claims 1, 10 and 18-21 have been amended to recite creating, in response to user input, a user-defined rule to process textual information. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of independent claims 1, 10 and 18-21 and claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, and 12-17, which depend from claim 10.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez ("SAP R/3 Implementation Guide") in view of Ball (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,863). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because any proper combination of Hernandez and Ball does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the GUI includes a representation of a condition of a user-defined rule to process textual information. The condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value. The method also includes receiving, via the GUI, user input that indicates the user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template. The rule template has a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule. The condition of the rule template includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. The method also includes receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and, in response, creating a second user-defined rule to process textual information. The second user-

defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder.

Hernandez discloses techniques for implementing SAP R/3 Release 3.0. See Hernandez at page 14. Hernandez discloses, among other disclosures, the R/3 Reference Model, on which business process modeling tools are based. See Hernandez at page 84. However, Hernandez does not describe or suggest many of the features recited in claim 1. For example, although Hernandez discloses “[c]arrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy systems and R/3,” Hernandez does not describe or suggest receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule, as required by claim 1. See Hernandez at page 206, line 15. Nor does Hernandez disclose receiving a user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and, in response, creating a second user-defined rule to process textual information, where the second user-defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder, also as required by amended claim 1.<sup>1</sup>

Ball, which is cited by the action as disclosing an attribute value, is directed to providing multiple interfaces that include at least one interface capable of understanding natural language. See Ball at col. 1, lines 58-62 (summarizing invention). Ball does not describe or suggest receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. Nor does the action assert that Ball does so. Hence, Ball does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1, as amended.

---

<sup>1</sup> These features were added by this amendment and naturally were not addressed by the action.

Accordingly, neither Hernandez, Ball, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule, as required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 4, 6 and 9, which depend from claim 1.

Independent claims 18 and 20 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer-readable medium and system, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 18 and 20.

Claims 2, 3 and 5, each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball and Whelihan (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0129659). Whelihan, which is cited in the action for disclosing “storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user” and “a user-defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of conditions,” does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 3 and 5.

Claims 7 and 8, each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball and Sharpe (“Teach Yourself SAP R/3”). Sharpe, which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of an attribute-value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7 and 8.

Claims 10, 11, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091695). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because any proper

combination of Hernandez and Morwood does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 10, 19 and 21.

Amended claim 10 recites a computer-implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the GUI includes a representation of an action of a user-defined rule to process textual information. The method includes creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule, where the action of the rule template includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. The method also includes creating, in response to user input, a second user-defined rule to process textual information, where the second user-defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the value placeholder.

As described above, Hernandez discloses “[c]arrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy systems and R/3.” See Hernandez at page 206, line 15. Hernandez, however, does not describe or suggest creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule, where the action of the rule template includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, as required by claim 10.

Morwood is directed to a remote computation framework. See Morwood at Abstract. The action relies on Morwood as disclosing an action that includes an action name and value. As such, Morwood does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 10 and its dependent claims 11 and 17.

Independent claims 19 and 21 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 10, and do so in the context of a computer-readable medium and system, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 19 and 21.

Claims 12, 13 and 14, each of which depends from claim 10, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Whelihan. Similarly to the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5, Whelihan is cited in the action for disclosing “storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user” and “a user-defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of actions.” Whelihan does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 12, 13 and 14.

Claims 15 and 16, each of which depends from claim 10, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Sharpe. Sharpe, which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of a value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

Applicant's identification of the differences between the claims and the applied references (e.g., Hernandez, Ball, Sharp, Morwood and Whelihan) should not be taken as an admission that any of the applied references properly constitute prior art.

Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated April 25, 2006, be extended for two months to and including September 25, 2006.

The fee in the amount of \$450.00 in payment of the two-month extension of time fee (\$450) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept. 25, 2006

Barbara A. Benoit  
Barbara A. Benoit  
Reg. No. 54,777

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331